

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FIVE

In re D.T., a Person Coming Under the  
Juvenile Court Law.

B215431  
(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. TJ17870)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

D.T.,

Defendant and Appellant.

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County.

Catherine J. Pratt, Judge. Affirmed.

Julia Lapis Balkeslee, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

  

---

D.T. appeals from a judgment entered pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 and the subsequent dispositional order.

The Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 petition alleged that appellant had committed a lewd act on a child, A.W., in violation of Penal Code section 288, subdivision (a). At the hearing, the court heard testimony from, inter alia, a security guard at the apartment complex where appellant and A.W. lived, and from A.W.'s mother, to the effect that appellant had taken two year old A.W. to a secluded place and touched her behind (in A.W.'s words) in a manner which made her cry. A.W. also said that appellant had his pants off, and A.W.'s mother observed that A.W.'s own pants were in disarray.

The court found the allegation true, sustained the petition, and ordered appellant suitably placed in an open facility for eight years.

We appointed counsel to represent D.T. on appeal. After examination of the record, counsel filed an opening brief in which no issues were raised. On or before August 7, 2009, counsel informed D.T. that she intended to file such a brief, sent appellant a copy of the record on appeal, and advised appellant that he could submit a supplemental brief in his own behalf. On August 11, 2009, we advised appellant that he had 30 days in which to submit by brief or letter any argument or contention he wished this court to consider. No response has been received to date.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that appellant's attorney has fully complied with her responsibilities and no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441; *In re Deon D.* (1989) 208 Cal.App.3d 953, 955-956.)

The judgment is affirmed.

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**

ARMSTRONG, J.

We concur:

TURNER, P. J.

MOSK, J.